



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

not understand its full import. This testimony is Goethe's communication to Zelter of Jan. 4, 1831 (Pniower, no. 846):

"Die zwey ersten Acte von Faust sind fertig. Die Exclamation des Cardinals von Este, womit er den Ariost zu ehren glaubte, möchte wohl hier am Orte seyn. Genug! Helena tritt zu Anfang des dritten Acts nicht als Zwischenspielerin sondern als Heroine *ohne Weiteres* auf."

Helena is no longer a 'Zwischenspielerin' but has become a 'Heroine,' yet she still enters 'ohne Weiteres,' that is, without a close *Motivierung* of her entrance such as there would have been if the prologue had not been abandoned. The non-execution of the prologue, therefore, simply increased by one more the number of the transitions which 'the intelligent reader' has to supply,²³ and did not affect the dramatic structure or presuppositions of the completed second and third acts in the slightest degree. It is impossible that Goethe intended for the shades of Helena and her maids, and Menelaus and his followers, to be present when Homunculus unites with the sea. Hence Valentin's hypothesis stands disproved for the third time.

Since of the three reasons for the impossibility of Valentin's hypothesis which have been given the first and the third may claim objective mathematical certainty, while the second may be considered scarcely less reliable, it will neither be necessary to accumulate any more evidence against the hypothesis itself, nor to enter further upon any other deductions and assertions in Valentin's last article. Valentin had the misfortune of founding his theory regarding Homunculus and Helena upon subjective æsthetic presuppositions instead of objective philological investigations, and after he had once established it and found wide approbation for it among other scholars, he became so strongly prejudiced in favor of it that it was no longer possible for him to recognize its weakness and to give the statements of the poet or the arguments of his

²³ Compare Goethe's letter to Wilhelm von Humboldt of Dec. 1, 1831 (Pniower, no. 912):

"Nun hat der Verstand an dem zweiten Theile mehr Forderung als an dem ersten, und in diesem Sinne musste dem vernünftigen Leser mehr entgegengearbeitet werden, wenn ihm auch an *Uebergängen zu suppliren genug übrigblieb.*"

opponent an objective and dispassionate examination. His fervent self-assurance and his brilliant style and dialectics cast a spell not only upon others but also upon himself so that he continued to the last to battle for a connection between Homunculus and Helena, and a conception of an artistic unity of the whole of *Faust* that could not exist without it. It does not seem any longer advisable to attempt æsthetic explanations of the whole or of parts of *Faust*, except upon the basis of a thorough philological examination of the text and all the other critical material.

A. GERBER.

Earlham College.

SPANISH GRAMMAR.

An Elementary Grammar of the Spanish Language, by L. A. LOISEAUX, Instructor in the Romance Languages and Literatures in Columbia University. New York: Silver, Burdett, and Company, 1900. 8vo, viii + 192 pp.

THERE are many text-books of modern Spanish grammar, but there are few good ones. Mr. Loiseau's *Elementary Grammar of the Spanish Language* has the merit of being short, concise, and practical, and it will therefore be welcomed by teachers of Spanish. The general arrangement of the book is good, but it is to be regretted that the conjugation of verbs is not introduced earlier. In a beginner's text-book it does not seem wise to treat fully nouns and adjectives,—including augmentatives and diminutives, numerals, etc.,—before taking up the conjugation of the regular and common irregular verbs. And, then, much valuable space is given up to lists of adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections, which might better be left to the lexicon. In the following review of the *Grammar* the criticisms and suggestions are arranged in the order of the paragraphs to which they refer.

§ 2. The meaning of the sentence "the sound of the Spanish vowels *never* changes" is not clear. If the author means that each of the Spanish letters *a, e, i, o, u*, always represents one sound, and one only, he contradicts himself in § 4. The statement that "the consonants are less distinctly pronounced than the

vowels," while on the whole true, should be modified in view of the fact that certain consonants, such as *l* and *r*, are pronounced more distinctly in Spanish than in English.—§4. The author makes no attempt to give the minor variations in sounds of the Spanish vowels, and it is probably best that he should not do so in an elementary text-book. It is to be regretted that the *Grammar* does not call attention to the diphthongal nature of *a* in *late* and of *o* in *go*, and warn the student to avoid the "vanish" when speaking Spanish. There is, in reality, little resemblance between the sounds of *a* in *late* and *e* in *papel*, nor between *o* in *go* and *o* in *mallo*. Never under any circumstances does Spanish *o* have the sound of English *o* in *come*. Possibly the author pronounces *o* in *come* like the *o* of German *kommen*.—§6. Spanish *b* and *v* are pronounced alike, not "almost alike." Usually *b* and *v* represent a bilabial fricative, as in *estaba*, *centavo*, etc.; but *b* after *m*, and *v* after *n* represent a bilabial explosive, as in *ambos*, *enviar* (pronounced *embiar*), etc. Moreover, at the beginning of a breath group *b* and *v*, if enunciated with emphasis, become explosive, as in *ven acá*, *¡basta!*, etc. It is true that the Academy maintains the fiction that Spanish *b* and *v* are pronounced like French *b* and *v* respectively; but neither to-day nor at any previous time have the Spaniards made this distinction. Theoretically, *d* final should be voiced (Araujo places it as "ápico-dental, fricativa sonora"), but in fact it is usually pronounced like *z* in central Spain. As for medial *d*, when it immediately follows a stressed vowel it is often omitted in informal speech wherever Spanish is spoken. It would be better to say simply that "*h* is silent everywhere," and omit "except in a very few words." It is unfortunate to teach the student that Spanish *ll* and *ñ* are pronounced like *lli* in *million* and *ni* in *onion*. It is extremely difficult for the English-speaking student to acquire the correct sounds of Spanish *ll* and *ñ*; but he should be taught at the beginning the difference between *ll* in *mi-llón* and *lli* in *million* (pron. *mil-yon*), and between *ñ* in *a-ño* and *ni* in *onion* (pron. *on-yon*). The author again follows the Academy too closely in stating that Spanish *x* represents the same sound as English *x*.

As a matter of fact in nine words out of ten Spanish *x* is pronounced like *s*, as in *texto* (*testo*), *expedición* (*espedición*), etc. Medial *x* is usually pronounced like English *x*, as in *éxito*, but even to this rule there are exceptions; as, *exacto* (*esacto*).—§7. It would have been better to omit (1), (b): "in most of the nouns ending in *n*, etc.," since the insertion of these words causes confusion and gives a needless exception. Under REMARKS, the wording of (c) should be modified to allow for such changes in accentuation as occur in *joven*, *jóvenes*; *nación*, *naciones*.—§8. The meaning of the Note is not clear; a line may certainly begin with a single vowel, such as *á, y*, etc.

§19. The rule should read: "Spanish nouns have only two genders, etc."—§27. Would it not be better to change (1), (a) to "with an unaccented vowel or diphthong," and (2), (c) to "with an accented vowel (except *é*) or diphthong"? The author could then omit (2), (b), since *ley*, *rey*, etc., end in a stressed diphthong.—§34. The endings *azo* and *ada* mentioned in the Note are out of place here, since they have nothing whatever to do with the augmentative suffixes.—§35. It is to be regretted that the author did not state, at least in a foot note, when to use *ito*, *cito*, or *ecito*, etc.—§37. The second sentence in this rule would be improved by changing it to read: "An adjective qualifying two singular nouns is usually masculine plural, unless both nouns are feminine, when the adjective is feminine plural."—§40. In (1) the adjective *suizo* is out of place.—§47. This and the following paragraphs treat of the "Position of the Descriptive (Qualifying) Adjective," and not of the "limiting (or determining) adjective."

§55. It is not quite correct to say that *que* is preferred to *de* in a negative sentence. It has been the experience of the present writer that the opposite is true. Moreover, there is a difference in meaning between *no . . . más de* and *no . . . más que*. Compare: *No tengo más de diez pesos* "I hav'nt more than ten dollars," and *no tengo más que diez pesos* "I have only ten dollars." In (3) the author has been led to make a mistake by following Ramsey's text-book. The rule from beginning to end is incorrect, as may be seen from the fol-

lowing sentences: *es más feliz de lo que era hace un año* "he is happier than he was a year ago;" *la casilla del hortelano es más bonita y limpia de lo que se suele ver* "the gardener's cabin is prettier and neater than one usually sees." Furthermore, no mention is made of the use of *del que, de la que, de los que, de las que*, as in *le ofrecieron más sueldo del que ganaba* "they offered him a larger salary than he was receiving;" *escribe y habla con más corrección de la que es común en su pueblo* "he writes and speaks more correctly than is common in his town."—§ 61. In (b) would it not be well to insert "often" or "usually" before "return"? In popular language it is becoming not uncommon to retain the diphthong when *ísimo* or a diminutive or augmentative suffix is added. Thus one hears *nuevísimo* oftener than *novísimo*, and in § 51 the author himself gives *nuevecito*.—§ 67. This should read: "*Uno* agrees with its noun in gender," thus *treinta y un hombres* "thirty-one men."—§ 101. Would it not be well to mention here more definitely the explicit forms *el de él, el de ella*, etc.? And should it not be stated that when a possessive pronoun is used predicatively, the article is usually omitted? Thus *esta casa es mía* "this house is mine."

§ 103. It would be best to omit the rule that "before *otro*, 'other,' *este* and *ese* become *estotro* and *esotro*," etc. These forms are not common in modern Spanish, and even in rapid speech the final *e* of *este* and *ese* is usually retained before *o*.—§ 118. This rule should read: "After a long preposition *el cual* or *el que* is preferable to *que*, etc."—§ 123. This and the following paragraphs treat both of interrogative pronouns and adjectives.—§ 126. It would be better to say: "*Quien* can refer only to persons, and is never used adjectively."

§ 142. Is it correct to say that "*haber* is used only as an auxiliary," when it may be used independently as a neuter verb and in a few expressions as a personal verb? The illustrative sentence, *tres años há*, is not a happy choice, in view of the fact that in expressions of time it is preferable to use *hacer* rather than *haber* when there is a definite period of time.—§ 163. The second part of this rule is out of place; namely, that "when a vowel precedes, a *z* is added to the *c* before *a* or *o*." This is

a purely phonetic change, and should not therefore come under the head of "Orthographic Changes." According to the system of classification adopted by the author, this change should be considered among the irregular verbs, for does not the stem *conoc-* change to *conozc-* before *a* or *o*; that is, is not the "theta" strengthened by adding the "k" sound?—§ 187. Would it not be better to say: "Besides, when unaccented, *e* becomes *i*, and *o* becomes *u*, if the next syllable does not contain accented *i*?"—§ 194. This rule could then read: "*u* becomes *uy*, if not followed by accented *i*."—§ 236. The rule that "*á* should not be used before a common noun" is incorrect. On the preceding page the author gives *la madre llama á su hija*, and *hija* is a common noun. In 2 it would be better to omit the clause "or when preceded by a numeral." Cf. *busco á un hombre que canta bien* "I am looking for a (certain) man that sings well," *busco un hombre que cante bien*, "I am looking for some man that sings well;" *asesinaron á dos hombres que iban á tomar el tren*, "they murdered two men that were going to take the train," *asesinaron dos hombres* "they murdered two men."—§ 240. *Desde* should be included here. Ex. *desde entonces estoy enfermo*, "I have been ill since then."

§ 241. Is the statement in the note (p. 118) correct? Is not the reverse true? It is well known that the modern tendency is to use the past indefinite, rather than the preterite, whenever possible. The past indefinite is often used, even when the action occurred at a definite time entirely past, provided the action occurred recently, as in *ayer he descubierto una mano empuñando el asa de un ánfora* (Pérez Galdós).—§ 242. Attention should be called to the fact that the Spanish imperfect indicative is used with *hacía* or *desde*, just as the present tense is used with *hace* or *desde*. See § 240.—§ 245. The author does not explain the use of the past anterior tense in *leído que hubo la carta* . . . "when he had read the letter . . ."—§ 246. The Note at the foot of page 120 should be omitted. See § 259 and § 260, Note.—§ 251. The wording of (1) implies that only the subjunctive is used after verbs expressing *wish, fear*, etc. Would it not be well to compare *yo quiero hacerlo*, "I wish to do so,"

and *yo quiero que él lo haga*, "I wish him to do so," etc.—§ 257. In (b) does the author mean that the imperfect subjunctive is not used after a present tense to denote an action completed before the time indicated by the governing verb, as in *esto no quiere decir que el capitán fuese mal soldado*, "this does not mean that the captain was a bad soldier?" Would it not be well here to call attention to the fact that the past indefinite sometimes has the force of a present tense and sometimes that of a past tense? Compare *nada ha dicho que pueda ofenderme*, "he has said nothing that can offend me," and *esta mañana he dicho al criado que subiese el baúl*, "I told the servant this morning to take the trunk up stairs."—§ 259. No end of confusion results from the names "present subjunctive" and "future subjunctive, since both forms may be either present or future; thus, in *dado caso que esté*, or *estuviere*, *aquí*, *se lo diré*, "in case he is here, I shall tell him," both *esté* and *estuviere* are present tenses; while in *luego que escriba*, or *escribiere*, *la carta la mandaré al correo*, "as soon as he writes the letter, I shall send it to the postoffice," both *escriba* and *escribiere* are future tenses. The "present subjunctive" may be substituted for the "future subjunctive," except after the conjunction *si*, when the present indicative may be substituted for the "future subjunctive."

§ 275. Under Examples, would it not be better to read "*Les oímos tocar el violín*," since *tocar* has a direct object? It is true that this rule is not always followed even by some otherwise careful writers. On the other hand a pronounced "*leísta*" like Pérez Galdós would use *les* even when the following infinitive was intransitive, as in *les vimos salir*, "we saw them go out."—§ 280. This should read: "Adverbs are derived from most *descriptive* (or *qualifying*) adjectives, etc."—§ 284. The use of *lo* with the superlative of adverbs is not explained.—§ 288. The rule as here stated does not make allowance for such expressions as the following: *viene aquí dos veces al día* (Juan Valera); *por más que nosotros aquí en el campo*, etc.; *todo lo que se gasta acá sale de mi propio bolsillo* (Alarcón); *casi se arrepintieron de haber ido hasta allí* (Juan Valera); etc.—§ 290.—Would it not be better to omit in

an elementary grammar the foot-note on page 146, inasmuch as *may* is used with *mayor*, etc., only when they refer to health, and even then *mucho* is not uncommon—§ 302. *En*, when used with the present participle, means 'after.'—§ 308. This paragraph is largely unnecessary, since *para* and *por* followed by an infinitive have the same force as when followed by a noun or pronoun; thus, *pagan para entrar*, "they pay *in-order-to* get in;" *ofrecen dinero por entrar* "they offer money *in-exchange-for* getting in; *doy un paseo para distraerme* "I take a walk *in-order-to* amuse myself; *doy un paseo por distraerme* "I take a walk *for-the-sake-of* amusing myself," etc.

Since we are connected politically with Cuba and Puerto Rico, and commercially with other Spanish-American states, would it not be best, even in an elementary grammar, to treat briefly the characteristic features of Spanish-American speech? The reviewer would suggest that the following facts be included: In Spanish-America, as well as in some parts of Spain, *c* + *e*, *i*, and *z* are pronounced like *s*, thus *cera* (pron. *sera*), *zapato* (pron. *sapato*); *d* final is usually omitted, thus *ciudad* (pron. *siudd*); *ll* is usually pronounced like *y*, thus *calle* (pron. *caye*).—§ 31, Note. Throughout the greater part of Spanish-America, *Señor José Herrera* is the usual expression, rather than *Don José Herrera*.—§ 35. In Cuba the diminutive suffix *ico* is in common use, and it regularly replaces *ito* after a stem ending in *t*, thus *gatico*, *platico*, etc.—§ 80. The foot-note on page 36 is correct in so far as it refers to Central Spain. In Spanish-America, however, *lo* is retained in popular speech as the regular form of the masculine accusative singular, and it is used of both persons and things.—§ 290, Note. *Muy mucho* is not uncommon in some parts of Spanish-America.

While the author's English is usually correct, two errors should be noted, namely, the use of *nice* in § 35, and "There are good news" in § 145.

The following errata and misprints have been noted:

§ 5, *belong* for *belongs* ("and each belongs to a distinct syllable"); § 25, *including* for *included*; § 186, § 164 for § 163; § 251 (2), *le* for *lo* ("¿Cree V. que lo haya hecho?"); § 261, in

the Examples under Note, *No* for *Nos* (" *Nos aseguraba que* +"). Finally, in the conjugation of *haber*, *ser*, and *estar* the accentuation is imperfect. There should be no accent on *hayamos*, *habremos*, *hubisteis*, *hubierais*, *hubieseis*, *hubiereis*, *fuisteis*, *fuerais*, *fueseis*, *fuereis*, *estabais*, *estaremos*, *estuvisteis*, *estuvierais*, *estuvieseis*, *estuviereis*, etc., and there should be an accent mark on *hayáis*, *sedís*, *estáis*, *estéis*, etc. These errors of accentuation occur to a lesser extent in the conjugation of other verbs. Moreover, there should be no accent on *crisis*, § 28, *tí*, § 80; and *fe*, § 98.

E. C. HILLS.

Rollins College.

ETYMOLOGY.

Kurzgefasstes Etymologisches Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache, zweite verbesserte Auflage, von Dr. C. C. UHLENBECK, Professor an der Univ. Leiden. Amsterdam: Johannes Müller.

THE second edition of Uhlenbeck's well-known *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* is a decided improvement on an already good book. Not the least of its good qualities is the reference often made to etymologies with which the author does not always agree.

Its chief fault is the small space devoted to the development of meaning, though it is perhaps hardly fair to call that a fault in an etymological dictionary which claims to be "kurzgefasst." Moreover, it is a fault that is common to most if not all etymological dictionaries. But it is nevertheless a fault. For it is only where we can trace a group of words to their primary meaning that we really know anything about those words. To study the outward form, the phonetic changes, is necessary in all word-study. But after all the main thing is to know the real life-history of the idea in the word. If this is not gained, nothing of any practical importance is gained as far as the words themselves are concerned.

Now in establishing the etymology of a word two principles may be set down: (1) "Difference in meaning is of itself no bar to connecting words" (*AJP.* xix, 40 ff.); (2) "Similarity in meaning is no ground for connecting words" (*AJP.* xx, 254 ff.). Judged by

these principles the following etymologies must be declared faulty.

Goth. *arbaip̃s* 'arbeit, mühsal': Lith. *dārbas* 'arbeit.' With the latter compare OE. *ge-deor̃f* 'labor, effort, hardship,' etc. (*AJP.* xx, 258 f.).—G. *beidan* is unnecessarily separated from *baidjan*. For the former we may assume the primary meaning 'press upon, hold,' whence 'endure, hold out, continue,' etc. From this we certainly need not separate *baidjan* 'zwingen,' OE. *bādan*, 'compel; urge on, incite; solicit, require; afflict, oppress,' etc., nor Gk. *πειθω* 'impel, stir up; prevail upon, persuade,' etc.—With Alban. *bē* 'eid, schwur' compare OE. *bād* 'pledge, thing distrained.'—G. *hiufan* 'wehklagen:'. Lat. *cupiō* 'begehre:'. Skt. *kūpyati* 'gerät in aufregung, wallt auf, erzürnt, zürnt' is regarded with disfavor. And yet we have here the three most natural developments from the primary meaning 'stir, be agitated' as seen in Skt. *cōpati* 'bewegt sich, rührt sich.' Not only are these related but they are further connected with Gk. *καπνός* 'smoke,' Lith. *kvepiū* 'exhale,' etc., base *geu̯epo-* (*Pub. MLA.* xiv, 302).—G. *hwairnei* 'hirnschädel:'. OHG. *hirni* 'gehirn' should not be compared. They are phonetically and semasiologically distinct. The one with IE. *q̥s-* goes back to the meaning 'shell,' the other with IE. *k̑-* goes back to 'top, point,' whence 'head, horn, summit,' etc.—G. *kalbō* 'kalb,' Gk. *δελφύς*, etc., cannot be combined with Gk. *βέφος* unless we assume a primitive root (*e*)*g̑so-*, which is only the barest possibility. They may, however, be referred to a primary meaning (*AJP.* xix, 46 ff.).—ON. *krof* 'the cut up carcass of a slaughtered animal,' *kryfja* 'split, embowel' should be taken rather with OE. *ceorfan* 'cut, cut down; cut out; tear,' Gk. *γράφω* 'scratch, write.'—G. *marzjan* 'ärgern, anstoss geben,' OE. *mierran* 'hinder; squander, waste' are easily combined with Skt. *m̐syatē* 'vernachlässigt, verzeiht, vergisst,' Lith. *mišyti* 'vergessen' through the root *mer-s-* 'rub, rub away, make soft; give way, forgive, forget.' Compare Skt. *mṛdú* 'weich, zart, mild,' Gk. *μαλδύνω* 'crush, destroy, ruin; soften, weaken, Lat. *mollis*, *mollis*, OE. *melan* 'be consumed, melt.'—G. *sugil* should be separated from *sauil* 'sun' and connected with OE. *swegl* 'sky, heaven; sun,' *swegle* 'bright,' OS. *swigli*